

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION**

STANLEY E. REDICK, III,  
Plaintiff,

v.

COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE, et al.,  
Defendant.

Case No. 2:25-cv-02530-ODW-BFM

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE:  
TRANSFER VENUE TO  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA**

On March 21, 2025, Plaintiff Stanley E. Redick III filed a civil rights complaint in this District. (ECF 1.) In a declaration attached to the Complaint, Plaintiff states that he was wrongfully arrested for theft, and that the charges were ultimately dismissed. (ECF 2 at 2.) Plaintiff claims that the judge assigned to the case, Tuolumne County Superior Court Judge Siebert, acted improperly. (ECF 2 at 2.) He alleges judicial and prosecutorial misconduct. (ECF 1 at 3.) Plaintiff names as Defendants Tuolumne County; Judge Siebert; and Judge Laura Krieg, who prosecuted Plaintiff and is now a sitting superior court judge in Tuolumne County. (ECF 1 at 2.) Tuolumne County is in the Eastern District

1 of California. 28 U.S.C. § 84(b).

2 The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based  
3 on diversity jurisdiction, be brought only in: “(1) a judicial district in which any  
4 defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the  
5 district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events  
6 or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred . . . ; or (3) if there is no district in  
7 which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any  
8 judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal  
9 jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

10 Here, Judges Siebert and Craig sit in Tuolumne County, and there is no  
11 reason to believe that either of them resides in the Central District of California.  
12 Moreover, from Plaintiff’s description of his claims, there is no reason to think  
13 that any relevant event happened in this District. Thus, there is no apparent  
14 connection between the Central District of California and Plaintiff’s claims and  
15 no showing that venue lies in this District based on the requirements of 28  
16 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

17 Plaintiff asserts that venue is proper in this District because the “County  
18 of Tuolumne cannot provide an unbiased forum due to systemic misconduct and  
19 entrenched conflicts of interest.” (ECF 1 at 2.) But Plaintiff has not explained  
20 why the District Court located in the Eastern District of California—the *federal*  
21 court that covers Tuolumne County—cannot hear his claim. In any event, these  
22 allegations do not give the Court the authority to entertain this lawsuit. *See*  
23 *Smith v. U.S. Dep’t of Educ.*, No. C 07-04885CW, 2007 WL 4357546, at \*1 (N.D.  
24 Cal. Dec. 11, 2007).

25 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), if venue does not properly lie in this  
26 District, then the Court either must dismiss the action, or if it be in the interest  
27 of justice, must transfer the action to the proper district. *See Starnes v. McGuire*,

28

1 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The Court may do so sua sponte, so long as  
2 it gives the parties an opportunity to be heard. *Costlow v. Weeks*, 790 F.2d 1486,  
3 1488 (9th Cir. 1986).

4 The Court therefore notifies Plaintiff that it is considering transferring  
5 his case to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California  
6 where venue appears to lie. **No later than April 3, 2025**, Plaintiff is  
7 therefore **ORDERED** to show cause—to explain in writing—why this action  
8 should not be transferred on the basis of improper venue. **Failure to file a**  
9 **timely response to this Order will result in the transfer of this action**  
10 **for the reasons set forth above.**

11  
12 DATED: March 24, 2025



---

BRIANNA FULLER MIRCHEFF  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE